

Message

---

**From:** Strynar, Mark [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5A9910D5B38E471497BD875FD329A20A-STRYNAR, MARK]  
**Sent:** 5/6/2019 2:30:56 PM  
**To:** Leung, Lam-Wing H [LAM.H.LEUNG-1@chemours.com]  
**CC:** McCord, James [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=McCord, James]  
**Subject:** RE: ⚠ NVHOS Orbitrap/QTOFMS work

FYI,

Synquest now sells the Nafion BP2 as a standard. Our assessment on our Orbitrap shows it is highly pure (99.32%) with a small amount of NVHOS (0.68%) as I think we saw in the standard you all shared with us. However, I think back then the purity of Nafion BP2 was around 78% or so with NVHOS and KF? Being the main impurities.

Mark

---

**From:** Leung, Lam-Wing H <LAM.H.LEUNG-1@chemours.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 06, 2019 9:55 AM  
**To:** Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** McCord, James <mccord.james@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: ⚠ NVHOS Orbitrap/QTOFMS work

Hi Mark,

Thanks for the message and my apologies for late responding. We're gathering some data internally and comparing with what you reported in your paper but it's been taking much longer time than I anticipated. I'll get back to you and James regarding what we've found likely in a week or so. Thanks again.

Best Regards,  
Lam

---

**Lam Leung, Ph.D.**  
Technical Fellow  
[lam.h.leung-1@chemours.com](mailto:lam.h.leung-1@chemours.com)  
302 353 5218 o  
302 985 1655 m  
**The Chemours Company**  
Experimental Station 402/5323  
200 Powder Mill Road  
Wilmington, DE 19803  
USA



[LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Chemours.com](#)

**From:** Strynar, Mark [<mailto:Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 26, 2019 8:21 AM  
**To:** Leung, Lam-Wing H <[LAM.H.LEUNG-1@chemours.com](mailto:LAM.H.LEUNG-1@chemours.com)>  
**Cc:** McCord, James <[mccord.james@epa.gov](mailto:mccord.james@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** △ NVHOS Orbitrap/QTOFMS work

External email. Confirm links and attachments before opening.

Lam,

Here are a few slides we would like to discuss at your convenience. I see why you believe the proton is where it is based on the compound #19 (see slides #2) which we also found. Based on the QTOFMS data in slide #1 we drew the proton assignment for the structure show.

Follow-up Orbitrap work last week on the NVHOS Chemours standard and the Chemours outfall 002 water Week #1 (when we began working with NCDEQ) we see both the 184.9 and 116.9 fragments. See slides #3-5.

There are two possible reasons for this discrepancy as I see it:

1. We have coeluting structural isomers; perhaps ion mobility QTOFMS can clear this up.
2. We have a gas phase rearrangement in the gas phase of the MS/MS for fragments we see

Glad to chat when you have a chance. You were not the only one who asked this question.

Mark

Dr. Mark J. Strynar  
Physical Scientist  
US EPA  
National Exposure Research Laboratory  
919-541-3706  
[Strynar.mark@epa.gov](mailto:Strynar.mark@epa.gov)

This communication is for use by the intended recipient and contains information that may be privileged, confidential or copyrighted under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby formally notified that any use, copying or distribution of this e-mail, in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail from your system. Unless explicitly and conspicuously designated as "E-Contract Intended", this e-mail does not constitute a contract offer, a contract amendment, or an acceptance of a contract offer. This e-mail does not constitute a consent to the use of sender's contact information for direct marketing purposes or for transfers of data to third parties.

Francais Italiano Deutsch Portuges Espanol Japanese Chinese Korean

[https://www.chemours.com/Chemours\\_Home/en\\_US/email\\_disclaimer.html](https://www.chemours.com/Chemours_Home/en_US/email_disclaimer.html)